

REMARKS

1-3. A proposed drawing correction is submitted herewith to resolve the objections raised by the Examiner.

4. (a) The phrase "such" dock has been replaced with --a-- dock to clarify the language of Claims 1, 4, 10, 16, 17, 19 and 20.

(b) Claim 4 has been amended to clarify the language thereof to recite "said cradle --and a respective said piling, each said guide member being-- [and] slidably" to resolve the objection of the Examiner.

(c) With regard to Claim 10, "movable" has been cancelled in line 8 and replaced with --extensible--.

(d) Claim 16 has been amended to cancel "boat lift" and insert --assembly-- to correct the language thereof.

(e) Claim 17, lines 6 and 16 has been amended to recite piston --arm-- to correct the language thereof.

(g) Claims 19 and 20 now recite --assembly-- and "boat lift" has been cancelled.

(h) Claim 19 has been amended in accord with the Examiner's suggestion.

5. Claims 1, 3-6 and 9 are not obvious under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) in light of Seal '996 and Williamson '366.

Seal '996 discloses a boat lift that employs three electrically-operated winches that are operated in unison by a master switch or by the use of individual switches if the elevation of the three separate carriers requires adjustment.

Claim 1 as currently amended recites:

"said cable means including a first pulley mounted to said piston arm and a second pulley mounted to a dock adjacent said first pulley and a third pulley mounted to a dock at a location spaced away from said second pulley, a first cable having one end attached to said cradle and a second cable having one end attached to said cradle spaced away from said first cable, a bracket for affixing other ends of both said cables to a dock at a single location, said first cable threaded around said second pulley and said first pulley, said second cable threaded around said third pulley and said second pulley and said first pulley such that the vertical distance of movement of said cradle is

twice the distance of movement of said piston arm when said hydraulic operating means is operated for moving said cradle vertically.”

6. The present invention provides a lift approximately twice the travel length of the piston arm when the apparatus is operated. While it is correct that seal ‘996 employs cables and pulleys, it is not at all clear how the 2x lifting distance of the present invention could be accomplished with the winches cited. Williamson ‘366 does disclose that a dock may be included to the overall apparatus but such feature does not render Claim 1 (currently amended) obvious in light of the cited art in any appropriate combination.

Claims 3-6 and 9 depend on Claim 1 (currently amended) and are not obvious in light of the cited art. The additional apparatus cited by the Examiner does not teach or suggest the invention of Claims 3-6 and 9.

7. The subject matter of Claim 2 has been incorporated in Claim 1 (currently amended).

8. Claim 7 is not obvious in view of Seal ‘996, Williamson ‘366 and Rockwood ‘940. Claim 7 depends on Claim 1 (currently amended). It is not at all obvious that the lifting apparatus of Williamson and Rockwood could be employed in the 2x lifting system of the present invention.

9. Claim 8 now depends on Claim 1 (currently amended) and is not obvious in light of Seal ‘996, Williamson ‘366, Rockwood ‘940 and Keesling ‘671. As before, the cited references do not disclose the 2x lifting capability according to the present invention that is obtained when using a second pair of pilings and guide members or any combination of the disclosed apparatus.

10. Claims 10-15 and 17-19 are not obvious in view of Seal ‘996, Williamson ‘366 and Penick ‘841. Claim 10 as currently amended discloses a 3x lifting capability through the use of hydraulic operating apparatus. It is not at all obvious how the hydraulic apparatus of Penick ‘841, which provides only a 1x lifting capability in any event, could be combined with the winches of Seal ‘996. It appears that three hydraulic systems would be required to substitute the hydraulic apparatus of Penick ‘841 into the seal ‘996 lifting system. Such combination of apparatus is not taught or suggested by the prior art.

Claim 17 as currently amended recites "said piston arm and cylinder being disposed horizontally to reduce the visual profile of said cable-handling system" thus clearly distinguishing over the prior art. The boat lifts referenced are all very high profile systems that also occupy a large area of the associated foundation structures.

11. Claims 16 and 20 are not obvious in light of Seal '996, Williamson '366, Penick, '841 and Rockwood '940. Claim 16 depends on Claim 1(currently amended) and Claim 20 depends on Claim 17(currently amended) and thus are not taught or suggested by the prior art in any appropriate combination.

12. In conclusion, it is true that the prior art employs various cable/pulley arrangements to lift boats. However, the present invention provides for a 2x or 3x lift capability with respect to movement of the piston arm. In addition, the present invention provides for cable-handling apparatus that is essentially flat on the dock to provide an extremely low visual profile. In addition, the present invention employs a hydraulic system as a deliberate design choice which also contributes to the low visual profile of the present invention. Finally, the combination of (1) a hydraulic system; (2) flat on the dock; and (3) a 2x or 3x lift.

Accordingly, Claims 1(currently amended), 3, 4(currently amended)-9, 10(currently amended), 12-16(currently amended), 17(currently amended), 18(currently amended), 19(currently amended), 20(currently amended) and 21(new) are not obvious in light of the prior art in any appropriate combination.

Claims 2 and 11 have been cancelled.

Claim 21 has been added to further define the present invention.

Respectfully submitted,


Arthur G. Yeager, Reg. No. 19,892

245-1 East Adams Street
Jacksonville, FL 32202-3336
Tel: (904) 355-9631
Fax: (904) 355-9632

Date: Dec. 29, 2004